

cent. That is perfectly true; but what was the state of things under the tariff in operation during the Mackenzie Government? It was this: The average rate of duty in 1878 upon the total imports into Canada from the United States was 9 per cent and upon the total imports from Great Britain it was 17 per cent, a discrimination of 8 per cent, the same identically as that which exists to-day. Did I say identically? Far from it. A discrimination infinitely greater, for this reason: that our imports from the United States consist now to a larger degree than ever before of free goods, whereas from Great Britain they consist to a larger degree than ever before of manufactured products. Why, these gentlemen who are posing to-day as the friends of trade with Great Britain, enjoyed five years of power, and I think we may fairly judge them by their works. What was the trade of our country when they took hold of the tariff? We imported in 1873, the last year of Conservative rule, \$68,500,000 worth of goods from the mother country. In 1878, after these gentlemen had been five years in office, we imported only \$37,000,000, or a decrease of \$31,000,000; whereas our trade with the United States increased from \$47,750,000 in 1873 to \$48,600,000 in 1878, or three quarters of a million of an increase, as compared with \$31,000,000 of a decrease in our trade with Great Britain during the period these gentlemen held office. If our tariff to-day discriminates against Great Britain, the trade returns do not bear that statement out, because we imported in 1891 \$5,000,000 worth more of goods into Canada from Great Britain than we did in 1878, the last year these gentlemen were conducting the affairs of the country. The one point I wish to press upon the House is that there was exactly as high a discrimination against imports from Great Britain under their tariff as exists to-day, that our trade with the mother country, in spite of the increase in duties, is larger to-day than when these gentlemen left office, and that the discrimination in our tariff, not as against British goods but as against that class of goods which we import from Great Britain, is not greater than it was when these gentlemen held office. They know perfectly well, as the Minister of Justice has said, that they are attempting to deceive the people of this country when they talk of discrimination against British goods in our own tariff. Why is it our imports of free goods from the United States are so large? Last year we imported \$4,000,000 worth of raw cotton from the United States. Now, if we impose a duty of 50 per cent on that article, would it promote trade with Great Britain? It would simply have the effect of adding a tax on the people without in any way assisting our trade with Great Britain. It is true, I am glad that it is true, that within the last two years we have had duties upon articles of agriculture and beef products for the purpose of protecting the Canadian agriculturist, but if these goods were made free, we should simply admit more of them from the United States without benefiting our trade with Great Britain in any degree. If the policy proposed were carried out, instead of our importing as we did last year three times as much of manufactured goods from the mother country as we did from the United States, the effect would be to revert to the condition of things which existed between 1873 and 1878. In other words to increase our imports from the United States and throw the trade which we now

do with Great Britain into the lap of the Americans.

House divided on amendment of (Mr. Davies):

YEAS:  
Messieurs

Allan,	Godbout,
Armstrong,	Guay,
Bain (Wentworth),	Langelier,
Béchar,	Laurier,
Beith,	Laverne,
Hourassa,	Leduc,
Bowers,	Legris,
Bowman,	Lister,
Brodeur,	Livingston,
Brown,	Macdonald (Huron),
Bruneau,	McGregor,
Campbell,	McMillan (Huron),
Carroll,	McMullen,
Cartwright (Sir Richard),	Mignault,
Casey,	Mills (Bothwell),
Charlton,	Monet,
Choquette,	Mulock,
Christie,	Murray,
Colter,	Paterson (Brant),
Davies,	Perry,
Dawson,	Proulx,
Delisle,	Rider,
Devlin,	Rinfret,
Edgar,	Rowan,
Edwards,	Saunborn,
Featherston,	Semple,
Flint,	Somerville,
Forbes,	Sutherland,
Frémont,	Vaillancourt,
Gauthier,	Watson,
Geoffrion,	Welsh, and
Gillmor,	Yeo.—64.

NAYS:  
Messieurs

Amyot,	Macdonell (Algoma),
Bain (Soulanges),	Mackintosh,
Baker,	McAlister,
Barnard,	McCarthy,
Bennett,	McDonald (Victoria),
Bergeron,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bergin,	McDougall (Cape Breton),
Bowell,	McKay,
Boyle,	McLean,
Cameron,	McLennan,
Carignan,	McLeod,
Carling,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Caron (Sir Adolphe),	McNeill,
Corbould,	Madill,
Curran,	Mara,
Davin,	Miller,
Davis,	Mills (Annapolis),
Denison,	Moneriff,
Desaulniers,	O'Brien,
Desjardins (Hochelaga),	Quimet,
Desjardins (L'Islet),	Patterson (Colchester),
Dewdney,	Patterson (Huron),
Dickey,	Pelletier,
Dugas,	Pridham,
Dupont,	Prior,
Dyer,	Putnam,
Earle,	Reid,
Fairbairn,	Robillard,
Foster,	Roome,
Fréchette,	Rosamond,
Gillies,	Ross (Dundas),
Girouard (Two Mountains),	Savard,
Gordon,	Simard,
Grandbois,	Skinner,
Guillet,	Smith (Ontario),
Hazen,	Stairs,
Henderson,	Taylor,
Hodgins,	Temple,
Hughes,	Thompson (Sir John),
Hutchins,	Tisdale,
Ives,	Tupper,
Kaulbach,	Turcotte,
Kenny,	Tyrwhitt,
Kirkpatrick,	Wallace,
LaRivière,	White (Cardwell),
Lépine,	White (Shelburne),
Lippé,	Wilmot,
Macdonald (King's),	Wilson, and
Macdonald (Winnipeg),	Wood (Brockville).—98.

Amendment negatived.